

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	10/709,485	05/09/2004		WEILU	3484		
	43447 WEI LU	7590	02/20/2008		EXAMINER		
	1218 BUBB R				NGUYEN, HUY D		
	CUPERTINO,	CUPERTINO, CA 95014			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
					2617	· - ·	
					MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			·		02/20/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/709,485	LU ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Huy D. Nguyen	2617		

	Huy D. Nguyen	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence add	dress
THE REPLY FILED 08 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follog places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complian time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice wing replies: (1) an amendment, otice of Appeal (with appeal fee)	of Appeal. To avoid aba affidavit, or other evider in compliance with 37 C	nce, which SFR 41.31; or (3)
a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires $3$ months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.	•	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for attention attention or (2) the date set for attention that the matter than SIX MONTHS from the matter (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN	illing date of the final reject	ion.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR tension and the corresponding amoshortened statutory period for reply or than three months after the mailing	unt of the fee. The approper originally set in the final Off	riate extension fee fice action; or (2) a
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complishing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	, to avoid dismissal of the	hs of the date of ne appeal. Since
	but prior to the data of filing - bu	بالمستقم وبالموس الثار كوار	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	onsideration and/or search (see low);	NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially	reducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally	rejected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	_	rejected olaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		-Compliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	llowable if submitted in a separa		_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	will not be entered, or b) uvided below or appended.	will be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14, 21.</u>			
Claim(s) vithdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•		
3.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, by because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing and sufficient reasons why the affine	a Notice of Appeal will <u>ned</u> davit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under ap	peal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			. •
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application	n in condition for allowa	nce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other: .</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	_	
		Jan 1	
,		JUSEPH PEILU	414.1513

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues Bushnell et al never teach or suggest supporting multiple wireless standards based on the open air interface BIOS signal processing architecture. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bushnell et al disclose a dual mode telephone station set with one Directory Number (see column 4, line 59 column 5, line 55), which fulfills the limitation of a wireless communication terminal device supporting multiple wireless standards based on the open air interface BIOS signal processing architecture. The Applicant argues Bushnell does not teach or suggest a computer system or base station to access various different backbone networks through broadband wireless communication systems of said open air-interfaces. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The cordless base station connects to POTS and also to the terminal 305 via Bluetooth (see figure 1) fulfilling the claimed limitations. The Applicant argues Bushnell does not disclose the terminal connecting directly to a wireline network. The connection to POTS via the cordless base station (see figure 1) is read to fulfill the limitation of "said wireless" terminal device connecting to different wireline networks through its wireline network interface unit in said wireless terminal device." The Applicant argues the repeater in Wee may not function as a base station. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out it is the combination of Bushnell and Wee applied against the claimed limitations. Further, the repeater disclosed by Wee reads on the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification of the claimed "base station." The Applicant argues Lockhart fails to disclose supporting multiple wireless standards, both in the forward and reverse channels, based on the open air interface BIOS signal processing architecture where the various wireless standards are mapped into open interface parameters for the BIOS based signal processing method. This limitation is not what the Applicant has claimed. The Examiner maintains Lockhart reads on the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed material in light of the specification..

2/13/08